

Perturbations Around Backgrounds with One Non-Homogeneous Dimension

Barak Kol

*Racah Institute of Physics
Hebrew University
Jerusalem 91904, Israel
barak_kol@phys.huji.ac.il*

ABSTRACT: This paper describes and proves a canonical procedure to decouple perturbations and optimize their gauge around backgrounds with one non-homogeneous dimension, namely of co-homogeneity 1, while preserving locality in this dimension. Derivatively-gauged fields are shown to have a purely algebraic action; they can be decoupled from the other fields through gauge-invariant re-definitions; a potential for the other fields is generated in the process; in the remaining action each gauge function eliminates one field without residual gauge. The procedure applies to spherically symmetric and to cosmological backgrounds in either General Relativity or gauge theories. The widely used “gauge invariant perturbation theory” is closely related. The supplied general proof elucidates the algebraic mechanism behind it as well as the method’s domain of validity and its assumptions.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Theorem	2
3. Discussion and applications	6
3.1 Spherical symmetry; Cosmology	8

1. Introduction

Consider perturbations around backgrounds with one non-homogeneous dimension (namely, with co-homogeneity one). This category encompasses two important and widely studied classes: spherically symmetric, static backgrounds where the radial coordinate r is the essential, non-homogeneous coordinate, and homogeneous cosmologies where time is the essential coordinate.

Technically, the problem may be reduced through separation of variables, expansion in terms of harmonic functions over the homogeneous spaces and dimensional reduction, to a 1d action invariant under certain gauge transformations. The issues are to optimally decouple the fields while choosing an appropriate gauge.

Recently, a specific case which belongs to this class was solved, that of the negative mode around the Schwarzschild black hole background [1]. The analysis followed by postponing any gauge-fixing; obtaining the action in terms of a “maximally general ansatz” (one which takes account of isometries yet is general enough to produce all equations from the variation of the action); using the power of the action formalism to transform the fields and decouple them into two sectors, algebraic and dynamic; and finally solving the gauge away, altogether reducing a problem of 5 fields and 2 gauge functions into a master equation for a single dynamic field. It was suggested there that the procedure could be generalized.

In this paper we make good that suggestion of [1]: we formulate the generalization in the form of a theorem and supply the proof, along with its conditions and limitations. We start in section 2 by setting up the problem and notation, and distilling the data for the general case. Then we choose a path to tread which leads us to the characterization of the algebraic fields in terms of *derivatively gauged* fields which we define, and to the formulation of theorem 1, which is our central result. After stating the theorem we prove it.

Our procedure overlaps with “gauge invariant perturbation theory” which is widely used in the literature. In section 3 we discuss its added value, and we provide further detail on the application to spherical symmetry and to cosmological backgrounds.

2. Theorem

Set-up. Consider a 1d quadratic action with a gauge symmetry. We denote the 1d variable by x , and the fields and gauge fields respectively by the vector notation

$$\begin{aligned}\phi &= \phi^i(x) & i &= 1, \dots, n_F \\ \xi &= \xi^a(x) & a &= 1, \dots, n_G\end{aligned}\tag{2.1}$$

where n_F, n_G are the number of (real) fields and gauge functions, respectively.

We wish to generalize the procedure of [1] to decouple the action. Since at this point it is not clear how to do that, we start by *distilling the data* for the general case.

The most general action quadratic in fields which is at most quadratic in derivatives is

$$\begin{aligned}S &= S[\phi, \phi] = \int dx \mathcal{L}[\phi, \phi] \\ \mathcal{L}[\phi, \phi] &:= \phi'^T L_2(x) \phi' + \phi^T L_1 \phi' + \phi^T L_0 \phi \\ &:= L_{2,ij}(x) \phi^{i'} \phi^{j'} + L_{1,ij}(x) \phi^i \phi^{j'} + L_{0,ij}(x) \phi^i \phi^j\end{aligned}\tag{2.2}$$

where $S[\phi, \phi]$ is a condensed operator notation for a quadratic form which operates on $\phi^i(x)$ which the second line describes in vector notation in terms of $(L_2(x), L_1(x), L_0(x))$, a triplet of $n_F \times n_F$ x -dependent matrices and finally the third line spells out the vector notation. $L_0(x)$ and $L_2(x)$ are symmetric, while since the action is defined up to the addition of $\partial_x \left(\phi^T \hat{L} \phi \right)$ where $\hat{L}$ is any symmetric matrix, $L_1(x)$ can be assumed anti-symmetric.

The gauging is linear in the gauge functions, independent of fields and we assume it is at most linear in derivatives, which is indeed the case when analyzing perturbations in GR or gauge theory. It is given by

$$\delta\phi = G \xi := G_1 \xi' + G_0 \xi\tag{2.3}$$

where the condensed operator notation of the first equality is exchanged by a vector notation in terms of $(G_1(x), G_0(x))$, a pair $n_F \times n_G$ x -dependent matrices.

Gauge invariance ties $\mathcal{L}$ and G by requiring

$$0 = \frac{1}{2} \delta \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}[\phi, G \xi]\tag{2.4a}$$

for all ϕ^i, ξ^a , and hence in condensed notation, which will be expanded later

$$\mathcal{L} G = 0.\tag{2.4b}$$

Altogether the quadratic form $S[\phi, \phi]$ holds all the data, including that of the gauging which must be (a subset of) its symmetries. Our purpose is to decouple parts of the action as much as possible. In other words, we wish to “diagonalize” S , to bring it to a canonical form. Of course S (or $\mathcal{L}$) is not an ordinary matrix whose entries are numbers, but rather

they are differential operators, or equivalently polynomials in ∂_x .¹ These observations lead us to an *algebraic approach* to the problem, namely to find the invariant properties of the quadratic form S .

Examples such as [1] show that the action contains a *mutually algebraic* sector, namely a subspace over which the restriction of $\mathcal{L}$ is algebraic and hence identical to the restriction of L_0 . How could that subspace be characterized? The following definition is central

Definition 1. The image of G_1 in field space is called *the derivatively-gauged (DG) fields*.

Notation. L_{DG} denotes the restriction of $\mathcal{L}$ to the DG-fields.

We may now state the theorem

Theorem 1. Given a 1d quadratic action with a gauge symmetry,² the following canonical procedure can be applied to decouple it into two sectors, algebraic and dynamic, and completely eliminate the gauge:

- A. The *derivatively gauged* (DG) fields are *mutually algebraic*.
- B. The DG-fields decouple from the rest after a shift in their definition (assuming the algebraic L_{DG} is invertible), or more precisely a certain shift in the definition of coordinates on field space.
- C. The shifted field coordinates are gauge-invariant.
- D. The remaining action is algebraically gauged³ and as such each gauge function can be used to eliminate a field ending up with a *dynamic* action in $n_F - 2n_G$ gauge-invariant fields (under the genericity assumption that both G_X , to be defined below, as well as G_1 are non-degenerate).

Proof. All of the algebraic information is contained in the explicit expansion of the gauge invariance identity (2.4) into powers of ∂_x (integration by parts allows to transfer derivatives from ϕ to ξ and vice versa so only the total number of derivatives matters). It is instructive to assume the special case where the L matrices are x -independent. In this case one may Fourier transform the action and obtain $\mathcal{L}$ as a matrix whose entries are quadratic polynomials in k , the Fourier conjugate of x , and similarly the entries of G are linear polynomials in k . The gauge invariance identity (2.4b) can be expanded into powers of k from k^0 up to k^3 yielding 4 k -independent identities (between constant matrices!), which is all the information one has, and they turn out to exactly suffice for the proof. Here

¹An algebraic structure consisting of “vectors” whose entries are elements of a ring, such as the polynomials, rather than a field (such as the real or complex numbers) is called a “module”. Accordingly, matrices with polynomial entries are linear transformations between modules. We are especially interested in the ring of polynomials in a single variable ∂_x . This ring allows for the procedure of division with remainder and is therefore said to be an “Euclidean ring”.

²Where the action is at most quadratic in derivatives, and the gauging is at most linear.

³Namely, $G_1 = 0$ when restricted to this sector.

however we shall start directly with the most general case where the L matrices do depend on x .

Item A. From the third (and highest) order of (2.4) in ∂_x we find

$$0 = \frac{1}{2} \delta \mathcal{L} = \phi'^T L_2 G_1 \xi'' + \mathcal{O}(\partial_x^2) . \quad (2.5a)$$

Since the equation holds for all ϕ^i, ξ^a we deduce that

$$L_2 G_1 = 0 \quad (2.5b)$$

with the interpretation that the DG-fields do not participate in L_2 , the kinetic part of the action.

Moreover, since $\delta S = 0$ identically so does the second variation vanish

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \frac{1}{2} \delta^2 \mathcal{L} &= (G_1 \xi'')^T L_2 G_1 \xi'' + \\ &+ 2 (G_1 \xi'')^T L_2 (G_0 + G_1') \xi' + (G_1 \xi')^T L_1 G_1 \xi'' + \\ &+ \mathcal{O}(\partial_x^2) = \\ &= (G_1 \xi')^T L_1 G_1 \xi'' + \mathcal{O}(\partial_x^2) \end{aligned} \quad (2.6a)$$

where in the last equality we used (2.5b). Since the equation holds for all ξ^a we deduce that

$$G_1^T L_1 G_1 = 0 \quad (2.6b)$$

This means that once the action is restricted to the DG-fields not only are the 2-derivative terms absent, but also so are the first derivatives

$$\mathcal{L}[G_1 \xi, G_1 \xi] = (G_1 \xi)^T L_0 (G_1 \xi) \quad (2.7)$$

and hence, by definition, the DG-fields are *mutually algebraic*.

Item B. We split the field space Φ into the DG-subspace DG with coordinates ϕ_{DG}^α and an arbitrarily chosen complement X with coordinates ϕ_X^r , namely

$$\Phi = DG \oplus X \quad (2.8)$$

or equivalently

$$\phi^i = (\phi_{DG}^\alpha, \phi_X^r) .$$

The action can be cast into the following form

$$\mathcal{L}[\phi_X, \phi_X] = \phi_{DG}^T L_{DG} \phi_{DG} + 2 \phi_{DG}^T (\mathcal{L}_m \phi_X) + \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_X[\phi_X, \phi_X] \quad (2.9)$$

through a step which involves integration by parts and yields the definition of the mixed part to be

$$\mathcal{L}_m = L_1 \partial_x + (L_0 + \frac{1}{2} L_1') . \quad (2.10)$$

The types of indices of L_{DG} are $L_{DG} \equiv L_{DG\ \alpha\beta}$ and we have $L_{DG\ \alpha\beta} = L_{0\ \alpha\beta}$, for $\mathcal{L}_m$ they are $\mathcal{L}_m \equiv \mathcal{L}_{m\ \alpha r}$ and finally for the remaining X -part of the action the types of indices are $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_X \equiv \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{X\ rs}$.

The square may be completed by defining the *shifted field coordinates*

$$\widetilde{\phi}_{DG} := \phi_{DG} + L_{DG}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_m \phi_X \quad (2.11)$$

where we used our assumption that L_{DG} is invertible to achieve a decoupling of the action into two sectors $\mathcal{L}[\widetilde{\phi}_{DG}, \widetilde{\phi}_{DG}]$ (algebraic) and $\mathcal{L}_X[\phi_X, \phi_X]$ (possibly dynamic)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[\phi, \phi] &= \mathcal{L}_{DG}[\widetilde{\phi}_{DG}, \widetilde{\phi}_{DG}] + \mathcal{L}_X[\phi_X, \phi_X] \\ \mathcal{L}_{DG} &:= L_{DG} \\ \mathcal{L}_X &:= \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_X - \mathcal{L}_m^\dagger L_{DG}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_m \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_m^\dagger$ denotes the adjoint operator of $\mathcal{L}_m$.⁴

Let us make two comments on the decoupling. First, the change of variables into the shifted fields (2.11) augmented by the identity on ϕ_X , namely $\widetilde{\phi}_X^r := \phi_X^r$ is an invertible change of variables, or more precisely, it has unit Jacobian. Second, note that $\mathcal{L}_X$ receives an extra term in the process $\Delta\mathcal{L}_X = -\mathcal{L}_m^\dagger L_{DG}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_m$ (2.12).⁵ $\mathcal{L}_m$ is at most linear in derivatives since the DG fields do not appear in the kinetic term (see the proof for item A above). Combining that with L_{DG} being algebraic we deduce that $\mathcal{L}_X$ still contains no more than 2 derivatives.

One may wish for a more geometric interpretation of the decoupling, especially since the choice of the ϕ_X fields seemingly introduced some arbitrariness into the process. Geometrically decoupling is tantamount to finding $DG^\perp$ – a subspace which is the S -complement to DG . Indeed $DG^\perp$ is given by the equations $\widetilde{\phi}_{DG}^\alpha = 0$ (while DG is given by the equations $\phi_X^r = 0$). Thus the arbitrary choice of the complement X is replaced by the unique S -complement $DG^\perp$. At first, our intuition with vector spaces may lead us to assume that any sub-space U has an S -complement. However, in our case where the components of vectors and matrices are polynomials rather than numbers¹ we should exercise caution and indeed it is found that the existence of the complement depends on the invertibility of the restriction of S to U .⁶

Item C. Requiring gauge invariance of the action in its decoupled form (2.12) we find that the piece which includes $\widetilde{\phi}_{DG}$ is

$$0 = \frac{1}{2} \delta\mathcal{L} = \widetilde{\phi}_{DG}^T L_{DG}^{-1} \delta\widetilde{\phi}_{DG} + \dots \quad (2.13)$$

⁴By definition $\forall \phi_1, \phi_2 \quad \int dx (\mathcal{L}_m \phi_1) \phi_2 = \int dx \phi_1 (\mathcal{L}_m^\dagger \phi_2)$.

⁵Such a process of decoupling or eliminating algebraic fields is commonly called “integrating out”, a name which originates from a path integral perspective.

⁶Indeed, while every subspace U still defines an S -orthogonal subspace $U^\perp$, the two do not necessary span the whole space. For example take the module $\mathbb{Z}^2$ (over the ring of integers) with the quadratic form $S = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & m \end{bmatrix}$ where m is any integer and take U to be the subspace generated by $u = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Now $U^\perp$ is generated by $u^\perp = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$; However u and $u^\perp$ do not span $\mathbb{Z}^2$, and that can be traced back to the fact that $S_U \equiv \begin{bmatrix} 2 \end{bmatrix}$ is non-invertible.

Since the vanishing should hold for any $\tilde{\phi}_{DG}$ and since L_{DG}^{-1} is invertible we immediately obtain the required

$$\delta\tilde{\phi}_{DG} = 0 . \quad (2.14)$$

Note that in this proof we used the gauge invariance equation (2.4) at orders 0, 1 in ∂_x , thus completing an all-order use of that identity.

Item D. By definition ϕ_X are algebraically gauged. If we denote by $G_X \equiv G_{0X}$ the gauging when restricted to $DG^\perp$, we define the dynamic space D to be the gauge invariant space, namely the quotient

$$D := DG^\perp / \text{Im}(G_X) \quad (2.15)$$

$\mathcal{L}_X$ is naturally defined on the quotient D since $0 = \frac{1}{2}\delta\mathcal{L}_X = \mathcal{L}_X[G_X \xi, \phi_X]$, and we call it *the dynamic action*, to distinguish it from $\mathcal{L}_{DG}$ which is algebraic.

Let us count the dimension of D

$$\begin{aligned} \dim D &= \dim X - \dim \text{Im}(G_X) \\ \dim X &= n_F - \dim \text{Im}(G_1) \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Therefore, whenever G_1 and G_X are non-degenerate we have $\dim \text{Im}(G_X) = \dim \text{Im}(G_1) = n_G$ and $\dim D = n_F - 2n_G$, as required. $\square$

Relaxing the assumptions. During parts of the proof we made the following genericity assumptions: that L_{DG} is invertible, and that G_1 and G_X are non-degenerate. We are not interested here in trying to relax these assumptions, though it could very well be that not all of them are necessary. For instance, if G_1 were degenerate it would mean that one of the gauge functions appeared only algebraically and as such it could serve to eliminate a field and the situation would reduce back to the case of non-degenerate G_1 .

3. Discussion and applications

Our central result is theorem 1 regarding 1d quadratic actions, which include perturbations around backgrounds with essentially one dimension, such as static spherically symmetric backgrounds or homogeneous cosmological backgrounds, in systems with gauge – be it either General Relativity or gauge theory. The result contains several messages

- The gauge can always be eliminated in favor of gauge-invariant variables, while keeping the action local (in x).
- Each gauge function “shoots twice” – first, it is responsible for an algebraic field (“constraint”), which decouples from the dynamic action, and second it is used to eliminate a field.
- The algebraic fields are precisely the “derivatively-gauged” (DG) fields (see definition 1).
- The proof follows step by step the expansion of the gauge variation identity (2.4).

Open questions. Several interesting directions for generalization remain open. Here we discussed the quadratic action, but it seems plausible that higher orders in perturbation theory can also be written in terms of the gauge-invariant fields. If we consider actions with more than 2 derivatives there seems to be no reason for a decoupled algebraic sector, but still there should be some canonical form, just like the one for a matrix over polynomials in a single variable. Finally, it is completely unclear at the moment how to proceed in dimension – to 2 essential dimensions and higher.

“Gauge-invariant perturbation theory”. Our procedure overlaps with the widely used “gauge-invariant perturbation theory” – the formulation of the equations solely in terms of gauge invariant fields. Moncrief (1974) [2] found the advantages of gauge invariant variables for perturbations around spherically symmetric background using a variational principle (much like the action method in [1]). The constraints were exhibited for general backgrounds and a detailed analysis was carried for the Schwarzschild background. Motivated by the analysis of collapse of a star Gerlach and Sengupta (1978) [3] applied it to perturbations around time-dependent homogeneous backgrounds and generalized by introducing the most general perturbed energy-momentum tensor. The method of Bardeen (1980) [4] is mathematically equivalent in some respects but aims for cosmological applications. See [5] and references therein for a review of this method when applied to cosmological perturbations, and see [6, 7] for more recent discussions of perturbations of the Schwarzschild black hole in the gauge-invariant formalism.

The author does not pretend to be much of a historian, but let us attempt to discuss the value added by the current paper. Comments and essential relevant references are welcome.

- We prove the procedure in full generality thereby clarifying the mechanism responsible for it, namely the algebraic properties of S , the quadratic form which is the action, and in particular the identities encompassed by (2.4).

In the literature it is commonly stated that the purpose of introducing the gauge invariant variables is to get rid of gauge ambiguity.⁷ Indeed gauge invariant variables are gauge invariant. However, this argument is misleading since the non-trivial content of the procedure is that there exists an invertible and local transformation (local in x) to these variables. To the best of the author’s knowledge this fact is proven here for the first time in generality.

- Our proof relies on the action being 1d, or more precisely on demanding that the transformation into gauge invariant fields be local only in a single dimension. In 2d

⁷For example “the formulation removes the annoyance and drudgery of dealing with ambiguities due to infinitesimal coordinate transformations” [3] (section I) as well as “We shall remove the necessity of referring to such solutions [gauge modes - BK] at all by introducing a set of‘gauge invariants’ ” (section IV). “To have genuine physical significance gauge independent quantities should be constructed from the variables naturally present in the problem, here the perturbations in the metric tensor and energy-momentum tensor” [4] (section 3). “In this review we develop a formalism ... [of] gauge invariant variables... [T]he physical interpretation of the results in unambiguous.” [5] (section 1).

(and higher) $\mathcal{L}$, G become polynomials in 2 variables ∂_μ , $\mu = 1, 2$; there is no unique definition of DG-fields, and there is no general principle to guarantee an algebraic sector. This is an important demarkation of the domain of validity of the procedure, which again appears here for the first time to the best of the author’s knowledge.

- Our procedure recognizes the importance of the “derivatively-gauged fields” (see definition 1).

General properties of the action. So far we discussed the solution of 1d actions. Before we turn to applications let us discuss some general properties of the construction of these actions for perturbations around co-homogeneity 1 backgrounds.⁸

A priori our procedure stresses the importance of using the action formalism in GR which in turn requires the use of a “maximally general ansatz” – an ansatz such that all the equations of motion can be derived from varying the action. However, with hindsight a “short-cut” ansatz is possible: it is enough to compute the action as a function of the fields appearing in an ansatz with all the n_G DG fields as well as some $n_F - 2n_G$ subset of the other fields to represent the dynamic sector. This is allowed because by gauge invariance the last n_G algebraically-gauged fields do not appear in the action anyway, but we shall not use it in this paper.

Perturbations around co-homogeneity 1 backgrounds in the variables x may be dimensionally reduced in a straight-forward way. The tensor indices of each field are decomposed into x and the rest. For instance, the metric perturbation tensor $h_{\mu\nu}$ decomposes into the x -tensor h_{xx} , the x -vectors h_{xi} and x -scalars h_{ij} where i runs over the other coordinates. The dependence of the fields on the homogeneous coordinates is expanded in harmonic functions, substituted back into the action and the homogeneous coordinates are integrated over. Finally the gauge functions are also dimensionally reduced via reduction of indices and harmonic expansion.

Continuous space-time isometries of the background become local (gauge) symmetries of the action while discrete isometries (which operate on the boundary) become global symmetries. In a gauge theory, on the other hand, all the symmetries of the background become global symmetries. Accordingly, the perturbations are charged under the isometries which they break. Since the quadratic action may include only interactions between fields in the same representation (more precisely, in a pair of complex conjugate representations), we recognize an important mechanism that decouples the action into sectors.

We shall now apply these principles to two main cases of physical importance.

3.1 Spherical symmetry; Cosmology

Spherical symmetry. Here we shall describe the counting of the dynamic degrees of freedom for the 4d Schwarzschild black hole, in the terms of this paper, and postpone the detailed analysis and the rest of the results to a later publication (work in progress).

⁸Namely, backgrounds where all but one coordinate belong to a homogenous space such as $\mathbb{R}^3$ or $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$.

Sector	“Even”	“Odd”
fields	$h_{rr} \ h_{rt}, \ h_{tt}$ $h_{ri}^{(1)} \ h_{ti}^{(1)} \ \text{tr}(h_{ij}) \ h_{ij}^{(1)}$	$h_{ri}^{(2)} \ h_{ti}^{(2)} \ h_{ij}^{(2)}$
gauge functions	$\xi_r \ \xi_t \ \xi_i^{(1)}$	$\xi_i^{(2)}$
n_F	7	3
n_G	3	1
$\dim(D) = n_F - 2 n_G$	1	1
$DG, \quad DG = n_G$	$h_{rr} \ h_{rt} \ h_{ri}^{(1)}$	$h_{ri}^{(2)}$

Table 1: 4d Schwarzschild space-time: counting the perturbation fields as an application of the general procedure of section 2. The action decouples into “even” and “odd” sectors according to the charge under the parity isometry. We list the fields and gauge functions in each sector. Altogether we “predict” 1 dynamical even field (the field appearing in the Zerilli master equation) and 1 dynamical odd field (the field appearing in the Regge-Wheeler master equation). Fields which are vectors with respect to the sphere (those which carry an i index) are decomposed into two families of spherical harmonics: one which is a gradient and another which is divergence-free, accordingly the fields are denoted by a (1) or (2) superscript. A similar notation holds for the tensor field h_{ij} . Finally we list the derivatively-gauged (and hence mutually algebraic) fields in each sector in the DG row.

Working in standard r, t, Ω , $\Omega \equiv (\theta, \varphi)$ Schwarzschild coordinates the isometries are $U(1)_t \times SO(3)_\Omega$. The essential dimension of the background which we called x in the general case is r , and the homogeneous 3 space fibered over r is $\mathbb{R}_t \times \mathbb{S}_\Omega^2$.

We wish to dimensionally reduce the action to a 1d action in r . The metric perturbation tensor $h_{\mu\nu}$ is decomposed into $h_{rr}, h_{rt}, h_{tt}, h_{ri}, h_{ti}, h_{ij}$ where i, j run over θ, φ . A harmonic decomposition of the fields means a Fourier expansion in the t direction and spherical harmonic decomposition in the angular coordinates, thus transforming each field $h(r, t, \Omega) \rightarrow \sum_{\omega, lm} h_{\omega, lm}(r)$. The gauge functions split as well $\xi_\mu \rightarrow (\xi_r, \xi_t, \xi_i)$.

An important role is played by the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ parity isometry. Fields whose parity is $(-)^l$ are called “even” while those with $(-)^{l+1}$ are called “odd”. Accordingly the action decouples into an even part and an odd part. Table 1 summarizes the counting of fields and demonstrates the formula for $\dim D$ (item D of theorem 1).

Cosmology. In homogeneous cosmology the essential coordinate is t , the homogenous fiber is $\mathbb{R}^3$ with its 3d Poincaré isometry. The 3d momentum operator may be diagonalized on the perturbation space, yielding the wave-number 3-vector $\vec{k}$. $\vec{k}$ breaks the 3d Poincaré group down to the 2d Poincaré group. The translation part of the latter is not broken, but the $SO(2)$ rotations may be broken according to the $SO(2)$ tensor type of the perturbation. Accordingly we distinguish three sectors which the action decouples into: scalar, vector and tensor. Note that while in the standard presentation the terms scalar, vector and tensor refer to $SO(3)$ here they refer to the “little group” $SO(2)$. Table 2 summarizes the counting of fields and demonstrates the formula for $\dim D$ (item D of theorem 1).

Sector	scalar	vector	tensor
fields	$h_{rr} \ h_{rz}, \ h_{zz} \ \text{tr}(h_{ij})$	$h_{ri} \ h_{zi}$	h_{ij}
gauge functions	$\xi_r \ \xi_z$	ξ_i	—
n_F	4	$2 * 2$	$1 * 2$
n_G	2	$1 * 2$	—
$\dim(D) = n_F - 2 n_G$	0	0	2
$DG, \ DG = n_G$	$h_{tt} \ h_{zt}$	h_{ti}	—

Table 2: Homogenous cosmology: counting perturbation fields as an application of the general procedure of section 2. The action decouples into scalar, vector and tensor sectors according to the charge under the $SO(2)$ “little group” isometry. We list the fields and gauge functions in each sector, remembering in 4d to associate 2 polarizations with each $SO(2)$ vector or tensor. Altogether we “predict” 2 dynamical tensor fields (the 2 polarizations of the graviton). If the $\vec{k}$ vector is taken to lie in the z direction and i, j run over x, y . Finally we list the derivatively-gauged (and hence mutually algebraic) fields in each sector in the DG row. If we couple gravity to matter, then as long as the energy-momentum tensor of the matter is spatially isotropic, the matter is guaranteed to couple only to the 2 algebraic scalar modes.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Vadim Asnin and Michael Smolkin for collaboration on related work.

This research is supported in part by The Israel Science Foundation grant no 607/05 and by the Binational Science Foundation BSF-2004117.

References

- [1] B. Kol, “The power of action: ‘The’ derivation of the black hole negative mode,” arXiv:hep-th/0608001.
- [2] V. Moncrief, “Gravitational perturbations of spherically symmetric systems. I. The exterior problem,” *Annals Phys.* **88**, 323 (1974).
- [3] U. H. Gerlach and U. K. Sengupta, “Relativistic Equations For Aspherical Gravitational Collapse,” *Phys. Rev. D* **18**, 1789 (1978).
- [4] J. M. Bardeen, “Gauge Invariant Cosmological Perturbations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 1882 (1980).
- [5] V. F. Mukhanov, H. A. Feldman and R. H. Brandenberger, “Theory of cosmological perturbations. Part 1. Classical perturbations. Part 2. Quantum theory of perturbations. Part 3. Extensions,” *Phys. Rept.* **215**, 203 (1992).
- [6] K. Martel and E. Poisson, “Gravitational perturbations of the Schwarzschild spacetime: A practical covariant and gauge-invariant formalism,” *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 104003 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0502028].
- [7] A. Nagar and L. Rezzolla, “Gauge-invariant non-spherical metric perturbations of Schwarzschild black-hole spacetimes,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, R167 (2005) [Erratum-ibid. **23**, 4297 (2006)] [arXiv:gr-qc/0502064].